

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action dated March 25, 2005. Claims 5, 9-10, 17, 21-23, and 40-42 remain pending in this application. Claims 5, 17, and 40 are the independent claims.

On the merits, the Advisory Action maintains the rejections of Claims 5, 9, 10, 21-23, and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,707; hereinafter "Reed"). Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) rejection for at least the following reasons:

Reed at least fails to recite or suggest: 1) sending a request from the first device to the second device that the second device provide its location to the first device in the event that the first device is unable to determine its location; 2) using the location of the second device as an estimate of the location of the first device. Rather, Reed recites transferring a location estimate from a first transceiver to a second transceiver by "transmitting, from a first transceiver, a location estimate," "receiving, at a second transceiver, the first transceiver's location estimate," "calculating a confidence level of the location estimate obtained from the first transceiver[,]" and "determining whether to update the second transceiver's location estimate and confidence level[.]" Col. 3, line 66 to Col. 4, line 18. Reed does

not recite or suggest any sending of a request between the devices, much less sending a request in the event that the first device is unable to determine its location. Rather, Reed is entirely based on confidence scores attached to determined location information. Additionally, Reed does not use the location of the first transceiver as an estimate of the location of the second transceiver, but rather uses the location estimate and confidence level of the first transceiver to determine whether to update its own location information based on which device has a higher confidence level. (See, e.g., Col. 4, line 54 to Col. 5, line 43) Only when the confidence level of the first transceiver is higher will Reed's second transceiver use the location information from the first transceiver as a location estimate of the second transceiver. Or this may be done as a weighted average of the location estimates based on the confidence levels (see, e.g., Col. 5, lines 44-55). Either way, Reed needs the associated confidence scores to determine which location position to use. This teaches away from Applicant's invention because it does not use location information from another device in the event that the first device is unable to determine its location.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) rejection of Claims 5, 17, and 40 for at least these reasons and requests its withdrawal.

Claims 9-10, 21-23, and 41-42 depend from one or another of the independent Claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant believes Claims 9-10, 21-23, and 41-42 to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron Waxler

Reg. 48,027

(914) 333-9608

April 25, 2005